

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/648,012 First Named Applicant: C. Earl Woolfork
Examiner: Andrew C. Flanders Art Unit: 2615 Status of Application: in appeal

Tentative Participants:

(1) C. Earl Woolfork (2) Megan E. Lyman
(3) Sinh Tran (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: Monday, April 21, 2008 Proposed Time: 10:00 (AMPM)

* or as soon as possible, I may be contacted at 919 341-4023

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☒ Telephonic (2) ☐ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) <u>112</u>	<u>Claims 30, 53, 56, 58</u>	<u>fuzzy logic descrip</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) <u>103(a)</u>	<u>19-28</u> <u>Claims 43-52</u>	<u>Lindemann & Sato</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) <u>103(a)</u>	<u>30-32</u> <u>Claims 53</u>	<u>Lindemann, Sato & Benfield</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) <u>103(a)</u>	<u>Claims 54, 55</u>	<u>Lavelle</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Continuation Sheet Attached					

Brief Description of Arguments to be Presented:

~~Per MPEP sec. 713.05, "An interview may be appropriate before applicant's first reply when the examiner has suggested that allowable subject matter is present or where it will assist the applicant in judging the propriety of continuing the prosecution." On page 39 of the Examiner's Answer he states that if the specification and claims disclosed and claimed more specifically the fuzzy logic detector, prior art could be~~

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.


Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Examiner/SPE Signature

Megan E. Lyman

Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

57, 054

Registration Number, if applicable

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

U.S. Patent Application No.: 10/648,012

Attorney Docket No.: 1028.1

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	:	Art Unit: 2615
C. Earl Woolfork	:	Examiner: Andrew
	:	Flanders
Confirmation No.: 3337	:	Filed: August 26, 2003
	:	
For: WIRELESS DIGITAL AUDIO SYSTEM	:	Customer No.: 68533

TRANSMITTAL

Dear Sir:

The Applicant respectfully submits this Continuation Sheet to PTOL-413A: "Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form."

Under Issues to be discussed:

Issue five (5) is a 103(a) rejection of Claims 41 and 42 with the prior art of Lindemann.

Issue six (6) is a 103(a) rejection of Claims 56 and 58 with the prior art of Lavelle and Benthin.

Issue seven (7) is the application as a whole as to whether a continuation or RCE (request for continued examination) should be considered.

Under Brief Description the last sentence should end with:

"prior art could be overcome by modifications. The Applicant respectfully requests this Interview to discuss such changes and potential continuation of the prosecution of this application."

Best Regards,



Megan Lyman, Reg. No. 57,054